Exhibit 14

From: Seeve, Brian <bseeve@princelobel.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 4:52 PM
To: Matthias Kamber
Cc: singular@princelobel.com; mkwun@kblfirm.com; abhansali@kblfirm.com; wgs-
              singularv.google@wolfgreenfield.com; kvp-singular
Subject: Re: Singular v. Google - Singular test code

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Matthias,

All of the information you requested is contained in lines 6 and 7 of the testing code we produced to Google over a month ago (the lines that begin "// nvcc …" and "// sudo …").

Please let us know if you wish to discuss further.

Best,

- Brian

> On Nov 18, 2020, at 5:31 PM, Matthias Kamber <mkamber@keker.com> wrote:
>
> Counsel,
>
> Following up on the below and our repeated requests, please confirm that you will provide the requested information and let us know when.
>
> Regards,
>
> Matthias
>
>
> > On Nov 11, 2020, at 5:03 PM, Matthias Kamber <MKamber@keker.com> wrote:
> >
> > Counsel,
> >
> > Following up on Singular's production of the testing code cited in its Amended Complaint and infringement contentions, and reiterating our prior requests, please let us know the following (or identify line numbers for where in the code this is disclosed, as you have suggested in your related letters):
> >
> > - What compiler command line was used to compile the source code into the executable code used for the test(s) underlying the infringement contentions?
> > - What hardware was used to run the tests, including the particular GPU?
> > - What command-line arguments were used to run the executable code?

As discussed last week, we are happy to answer similar questions about the test code files produced with Google's responsive contentions.

Regards,

Matthias

_____

Matthias Kamber
Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP
633 Battery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
415 773 6635 direct | 415 391 5400 main
mkamber@keker.com | vcard | keker.com
Pronouns: he, him, his